

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. INVTEL04001
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2011

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-26 remain pending in the application. No amendments have been made to the claims in this response.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by US Patent No. 6,760,804 (hereinafter "Hunt").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

"a first interface adapted to allow the IP access point to communicate with the point-to-point communication module wherein the first interface is adapted to be presented to an electronic device communicating in IP mode with the IP access point, in the form of at least one virtual port and the said first interface is adapted to be controlled by the said electronic device by means of control instructions."

Hunt does not recite the first interface.

Hunt pertains to emulating a wired connection in order to support legacy application running on Bluetooth-enabled devices. Referring to Fig. 2 of Hunt, Bluetooth-formatted data is received by the antenna 205 and the RF module 210 and the interface 240 converts this data into a format compatible with the legacy application running on a Bluetooth-enabled device 290 (see Hunt, col. 12, lines 19 – 53). The interface 240 has a virtual port that emulates the wired connection that is associated with the legacy application (see col. 2, lines 65 – col. 3, line 2). The converted data is then mapped to the virtual port supporting the legacy application. In this manner, the legacy application still works on Bluetooth-enabled devices that no longer have the wired connection.

However, the interface device of Hunt does not correspond to the first interface of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites that *"the first interface is adapted to be presented to an electronic device communicating in IP mode with the IP access point, in the form of at least one virtual port."* Referring to Figs. 1 and 2 of the Applicant's application, the personal computer 2 is able to communicate with terminal 1 according to an IP mode and can view the

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. INVTEL04001
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2011

PDA 4 or the wireless phone 5 as a virtual port. Hunt does not teach or suggest such a feature. The legacy application of Hunt is not presented the first interface of the claimed invention. The legacy application of Hunt does not communicate with the first interface of the claimed invention in IP mode with an IP access point. Instead, data is converted from one form into another form and then sent to a virtual port that emulates the wired connection of the legacy application.

Furthermore, the first interface of the claimed invention is adapted to be controlled by an electronic device by control instructions. Hunt does not recite "*said first interface is adapted to be controlled by the said electronic device by means of control instructions*". In fact, there is no need for an external device to control the first interface by means of control instructions since the emulation ensures that the serial connection is still operational.

The Examiner contends that "*said first interface is adapted to be controlled by the said electronic device by means of control instructions*" is recited in Hunt in col. 9, lines 6 - 16, and Fig. 5, "electronic device 500". Col. 9, lines 6 - 15 recites the following:

Multi-function serial port devices and drivers are common in communication networks. However, the creation of a serial port that is independent of the type or amount of underlying hardware is unique. Fig. 5 illustrates a architecture and data flow diagram for an exemplary electronic device 500 with wireless capabilities that provides interfacing capabilities between a legacy software application 510 that is not compatible with protocol associated with a wireless communication network or standard, such as the Bluetooth standard, in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention.

The above-cited section does not recite that the *first interface is adapted to be controlled by said electronic device by means of control instructions*. In fact, Hunt does recite that the electronic device interacts at all with an external device. "*The present invention provides an apparatus and method for providing an interface between legacy software*

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. INVTEL04001
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2011

applications and a wireless communication network. The present invention achieves the above accomplishment by providing for virtual communication ports that associate with a particular functionality and not a specific device or piece of hardware" (emphasis added) (col. 2, lines 19 – 25). Therefore, the electronic device of Hunt (i.e., interface device) is not adapted to be controlled by means of control instructions.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Hunt fails to recite each and every limitation in claim 1, and as such, claim 1 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by Hunt.

Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt in view of US Patent Application Publication 20050030974 ("Wright").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reason. Claims 5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and includes all the features of claim 1. In view of this dependence, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection since Wright is unable to remedy the deficiencies of Hunt explained above in conjunction with claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Customer No. 24498
Attorney Docket No. INVTEL04001
Office Action Dated: January 25, 2011

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance.

Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants solicit allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

In the event that there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
David Libault, et al.



By: Paul P. Kriel, Attorney
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Date: 5/2/11

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312